

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the May 3, 2006 Office Action, claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the May 3, 2006 Office Action, the applicants have amended claim 1, cancelled claim 3, and added new claim 13. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ishibashi et al. (US 5,202,281). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Newly amended claim 1 now recites that a dopant is infused in at least a portion of the thin portion that is immediately adjacent to the at least one through hole. In addition, newly added claim 13 recites that the dopant is infused in the entire thin portion of the semiconductor substrate. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification (see, for example, Paragraphs 0077 to 0081 and Figs. 2A to 2C).

The applicants respectfully submit that the semiconductor device now recited in the claims is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Ishibashi reference. As noted by the Examiner, the Ishibashi reference discloses a semiconductor device in which a portion of the thin portion of a semiconductor substrate is infused with a dopant, and a through hole is formed in the thin portion. However, the doped portion of the thin portion in the Ishibashi reference is not immediately adjacent to the through hole, but rather far removed from the through hole. In addition, only one small portion of the thin portion is doped in the Ishibashi reference, and not the entire thin portion.

Clearly, the structure recited in claims 1 and 13 is ***not*** disclosed or suggested by the Ishibashi reference, or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element

of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 13 as now amended, are not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the Ishibashi reference. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, on the ground that claim 4 is allowable in its current form because it is dependent upon claim 1, which as noted above, the applicants respectfully submit is now allowable over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, the applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication (including extension of time fees) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2042.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven Roberts/

Steven Roberts
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 39,346

Shinjyu Global IP
c/o GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Phone No. (202) 293-0444